1	A. KRISTINE FLOYD (BAR NO. 15593) NICHOLAS S. SHANTAR (BAR NO. 22	0) 28980)
2	ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP	,
3	1900 Main Street, Fifth Floor	
4	Irvine, California 92614-7321 Phone: (949) 553-1313	
5	Fax: (949) 553-8354 E-Mail: kfloyd@allenmatkins.com	
6	nshantar@allenmatkins.com	
7	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclain INDYMAC VENTURE, LLC	nant
8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
9	NORTHERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
10	EDEN GARDEN, LLC, a California	Case No. CV11-02356-HRL
11	limited liability company; ALI K. AMIDY, an individual; GUITI NAHAVANDI AMIDY, an individual;	ANSWER OF DEFENDANT AND COUNTERCLAIMANT INDYMAC
12	CENTRA NET INVESTMENT LLC, a California limited liability company;	VENTURE, LLC TO COMPLAINT
13	Plaintiffs,	[DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL]
14	,	
15	VS.	
16	INDY MAC VENTURE, LLC., a limited liability company, FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, as	
17	Conservator of IndyMac Federal Bank, FSB and Does 1 through 10,	
18	Defendants.	
19	INDYMAC VENTURE, LLC, a limited	
20	liability company,	
21	Counterclaimant,	
22	VS.	
23	ALI K. AMIDY, an individual; GUITI	
24	NAHAVANDI AMIDY, an individual; CENTRA NET INVESTMENT LLC, a	
25	California limited liability company,	
26	Counterdefendants.	
27		
_ ′		

28

Defendant and Counterclaimant Indymac Venture, LLC ("Defendant"), by
and through its undersigned counsel, hereby answers the Complaint ("Complaint")
filed by Plaintiffs Eden Garden, LLC ("Eden Garden"), Ali K. Amidy, Guiti
Nahavandi Amidy, and Centra Net Investment, LLC ("Plaintiffs"). Defendant
denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in the Complaint not
specifically admitted herein.

For ease of reference, Defendant repeats the primary headings in the Complaint. To the extent those headings may be construed as allegations against Defendant, they are generally and specifically denied.

Below, Defendant answers the specific allegations in the numbered paragraphs of the Complaint as follows:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Defendant admits that Eden Garden is a limited liability company formed and existing under the laws of the State of California. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 1 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every remaining allegation therein.
- 2. Defendant admits that Plaintiffs Ali K. Amidy and Guiti Nahavandi Amidi are individuals residing and/or doing business in the State of California, County of Santa Clara. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 2 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every remaining allegation therein.
- 3. Defendant admits that Plaintiff Centra Net Investment, LLC ("Centra Net") is a limited liability company formed and existing under the laws of the State of California and doing business in the State of California, County of Santa Clara. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the

remaining allegations in paragraph 3 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every remaining allegation therein.

- 4. Defendant admits that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC") is a corporation formed pursuant to the laws of the United States. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 4 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every remaining allegation therein.
- 5. 8 Defendant admits that Defendant is a limited liability company. Defendant further admits that it is an assignee of certain assets that originated with IndyMac Bank, FSB ("Original Lender"), including, without limitation, (1) that 10 certain Building Loan Agreement (Residential Tract Construction) dated as of 11 12 September 30, 2005 between Eden Garden and Original Lender, as amended ("Building Loan Agreement"), (2) that certain Additional Advance and First 13 Modification Agreement to the Building Loan Agreement; Promissory Note; 14 Construction Deed of Trust With Assignment of Rents, Security Agreement and 15 Fixture Filing and Other Loan Documents (Long Form) dated as of February 14, 16 17 2007 between Eden Garden and Original Lender and that certain Additional Advance and First Modification Agreement to the Building Loan Agreement; 18 19 Promissory Note; Construction Deed of Trust With Assignment of Rents, Security 20 Agreement and Fixture Filing and Other Loan Documents (Short Form) dated as of 21 February 14, 2007 between Eden Garden and Original Lender, (collectively, the 22 "Amendments"), (3) that certain Promissory Note dated as of September 30, 2005 23 between Eden Garden and Original Lender, as amended ("Note"), and (4) that certain Construction Trust Deed With Assignment of Rents, Security Agreement 24 25 and Fixture Filing dated as of September 30, 2005 between Eden Garden, as Trustor, Fidelity National Title Insurance Company, as Trustee, and Original Lender, as 26 27 Beneficiary, as amended ("Trust Deed"). Defendant is unable to determine what is meant by the phrase "and associated claims and cross-claims involved in this 28

1

2

3

4

5

6

litigation" as used in paragraph 5 of the Complaint, and therefore denies each and every allegation contained therein. Except as expressly admitted herein, Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

- 6. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 6 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every allegation therein.
- 7. Defendant is unable to determine what is meant by the allegations in paragraph 7 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every allegation therein.
- 8. Defendant admits that on or about September 30, 2005, Eden Garden and Original Lender entered into the Building Loan Agreement. Defendant states that the Building Loan Agreement speaks for itself and provides according to its terms. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegation that "the total Project cost was expected to be in the amount of \$7,667,490.00, with Plaintiffs contributing \$1,763,490.00 in cash and equity," and therefore denies generally and specifically that allegation. Except as expressly admitted herein, Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 8 of the Complaint.
- 9. Defendant states that (1) Section 3.00 of the Building Loan Agreement, (2) Section (b) of Exhibit "B" to the Building Loan Agreement, (3) Section (f) of Exhibit "B" to the Building Loan Agreement, (4) Section (g) of Exhibit "B" to the Building Loan Agreement, (5) Section 4.01 of the Building Loan Agreement, (6) Section 4.05 of the Building Loan Agreement, (7) Exhibit "E" to the Building Loan Agreement, (8) Section 4.11 of the Building Loan Agreement, (9) Section J of Exhibit "C" to the Building Loan Agreement, and (10) Section L of Exhibit "C" to the Building Loan Agreement all speak for themselves and provide according to

925397 02/OC

LAW OFFICES

- 10. Defendant states that Section (f) of Exhibit "B" to the Building Loan Agreement speaks for itself and provides according to its terms. Except as expressly stated herein, Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 10 of the Complaint.
- 11. Defendant states that the Building Loan Agreement speaks for itself and provides according to its terms. Except as expressly stated herein, Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 11 of the Complaint.
- 12. Defendant admits that on or about September 30, 2005, Eden Garden executed and delivered to Original Lender the Note, which speaks for itself and provides according to its terms. Except as expressly stated herein, Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 12 of the Complaint.
- 13. Defendant admits that the Note is secured by, among other things, the Trust Deed, which speaks for itself and provides according to its terms. Defendant further admits that the Trust Deed was recorded on or about November 8, 2005 in the Official Records of Santa Clara County, California ("Official Records"), as Document No. 18668901. Except as expressly stated herein, Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 13 of the Complaint.
 - 14. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 14 of the Complaint.
 - 15. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 15 of the Complaint.
- 16. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 16 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every allegation therein.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

4

6

8

16

17 18

19 20

22

21

24

23

25 26

27

28

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

	17.	Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the
truth	of the	allegations in paragraph 17 of the Complaint, and therefore denies
genei	rally an	d specifically each and every allegation therein.

- Defendant admits that Plaintiffs and Original Lender entered into the 18. Amendments, which speak for themselves and provide according to their terms. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 18 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every remaining allegation therein.
- 19. Defendant admits that Plaintiffs and Original Lender entered into the Amendments, which speak for themselves and provide according to their terms. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every remaining allegation in paragraph 19 of the Complaint.
- 20. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 20 of the Complaint.
- 21. Defendant denies that IndyMac Bank, FSB assured Plaintiffs that IndyMac Bank, FSB would extend the maturity date of the Note to March 2009 if Plaintiffs so requested. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 21 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every remaining allegation therein.
- 22. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 22 of the Complaint.
- 23. Defendant admits that on or about July 11, 2008, Original Lender was seized by the Office of Thrift Supervision and the FDIC was appointed as Receiver for Original Lender. Defendant further admits that on or about July 11, 2008, IndyMac Federal Bank, FSB ("IMFB") was chartered as a new institution and some of the assets and liabilities of Original Lender were transferred to IMFB. Defendant further admits that the FDIC was appointed as Conservator of IMFB. Defendant is

unable to determine what is meant by the phrase "including the claims and cross-
claims involved in this litigation" as used in paragraph 23, and therefore denies
generally and specifically each and every allegation contained therein. Except as
expressly admitted herein, Defendant denies generally and specifically each and
every allegation in paragraph 23 of the Complaint.

- 24. Defendant admits that on or about November 12, 2008, the FDIC filed a complaint against Plaintiffs in the Superior Court for the County of Santa Clara, Case Number 108CV127419 ("Prior Lawsuit"). Defendant states that the Complaint in the Prior Lawsuit speaks for itself. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 24 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every remaining allegation therein.
- 25. Defendant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 25 of the Complaint, and therefore denies generally and specifically each and every allegation therein.
- 26. Defendant admits that Defendant and Plaintiffs entered into that certain Agreement Tolling Statutes of Limitation dated as of May 4, 2010 ("Tolling Agreement"), which speaks for itself and provides according to its terms. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every remaining allegation in paragraph 26 of the Complaint.
- 27. Defendant admits that on or about May 5, 2010, Defendant and Plaintiffs executed a mutual dismissal of the Prior Lawsuit without prejudice, which was filed with the Court. Defendant is informed and believes that the Tolling Agreement was also filed with the Court. Except as expressly admitted herein, Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 27 of the Complaint.
- 28. Defendant admits that on or about May 24, 2010 a Notice of Default And Election to Sell Under Deed of Trust was recorded as Document 20720114 in

1	the Official Records and that thereafter Defendant proceeded with a non-judicial
2	foreclosure of the Trust Deed. Except as expressly admitted herein, Defendant
3	denies generally and specifically each and every allegation in paragraph 28 of the
4	Complaint.
5	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
6	(Breach of Settlement Agreement)
7	29. Defendant repeats and incorporates its response to paragraphs 1
8	through 28, above, as if fully set forth in this paragraph.
9	30. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
10	in paragraph 30 of the Complaint.
11	Defendant denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to the relief requested in the
12	Complaint or any relief at all.
13	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
14	(Promissory Fraud)
15	31. Defendant repeats and incorporates its response to paragraphs 1
16	through 28, above, as if fully set forth in this paragraph.
17	32. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
18	in paragraph 32 of the Complaint.
19	33. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
20	in paragraph 33 of the Complaint.
21	34. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
22	in paragraph 34 of the Complaint.
23	35. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
24	in paragraph 35 of the Complaint.
25	36. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
26	in paragraph 36 of the Complaint.
27	37. Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
28	in paragraph 37 of the Complaint.

1	38.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
2	in paragraph	a 38 of the Complaint.
3	39.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
4	in paragraph	a 39 of the Complaint.
5	40.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
6	in paragraph	a 40 of the Complaint.
7	41.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
8	in paragraph	1 41 of the Complaint.
9	Defer	ndant denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to the relief requested in the
10	Complaint of	or any relief at all.
11		THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
12		(Negligent Misrepresentation)
13	42.	Defendant repeats and incorporates its response to paragraphs 1
14	through 41,	above, as if fully set forth in this paragraph.
15	43.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
16	in paragraph	a 43 of the Complaint.
17	Defer	ndant denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to the relief requested in the
18	Complaint of	or any relief at all.
19		FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
20	(Fraud	In The Inducement – Loan Agreement, Note, Trust Deed, Amidy
21		Guaranty, and Centra Net Guaranty)
22	44.	Defendant repeats and incorporates its response to paragraphs 1
23	through 35,	above, as if fully set forth in this paragraph.
24	45.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
25	in paragraph	45 of the Complaint.
26	46.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
27	in paragraph	1 46 of the Complaint.
28		

1	47.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
2	in paragraph	47 of the Complaint.
3	48.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
4	in paragraph	48 of the Complaint.
5	49.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
6	in paragraph	1 49 of the Complaint.
7	50.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
8	in paragraph	50 of the Complaint.
9	51.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
10	in paragraph	51 of the Complaint.
11	52.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
12	in paragraph	1 52 of the Complaint.
13	53.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
14	in paragraph	53 of the Complaint.
15	54.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
16	in paragraph	54 of the Complaint.
17	55.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
18	in paragraph	55 of the Complaint.
19	56.	Defendant denies generally and specifically each and every allegation
20	in paragraph	1 56 of the Complaint.
21	Defen	adant denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to the relief requested in the
22	Complaint of	or any relief at all.
23		REMAINING PARAGRAPHS
24	The re	emaining paragraphs of the Complaint contain Plaintiffs' prayer for
25	relief to whi	ch no response is required. To the extent a response is required,
26	Defendant d	enies that Plaintiffs are entitled to the relief requested therein or any
27	relief at all.	
28		

925397.02/OC

1	<u>AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES</u>
2	Without assuming the burden of proof as to the following (other than the
3	burden, if any, imposed by law), Defendant asserts the following affirmative
4	defenses:
5	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
6	(Failure To State A Cause Of Action)
7	1. Plaintiffs' Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action
8	therein, fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against Defendant
9	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
10	(Statutes of Limitation)
11	2. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
12	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by the applicable statutes of limitation,
13	including without limitation, California Code of Civil Procedure sections 337, 338,
14	339, 340, and 343.
15	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
16	(Laches)
17	3. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
18	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of laches.
19	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
20	(Unclean Hands)
21	4. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
22	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by Plaintiffs' unclean hands.
23	<u>FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u>
24	(Parol Evidence)
25	5. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
26	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by the parol evidence rule.
27	
28	

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Mitigate Damages)

6. Assuming without admitting, for purposes of this affirmative defense only, that any of the allegations in Plaintiffs' Complaint are true, Plaintiffs, with actual or constructive knowledge of any and all such facts, were under a duty to mitigate damages, if any, and have failed to fulfill such duty; as a consequence, Defendant is exonerated from any liability to Plaintiffs, and damages, if any, are the sole and proximate result of Plaintiffs' failure to mitigate damages.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Proximate Cause)

7. Assuming without admitting, for purposes of this affirmative defense only, that any of the allegations in Plaintiffs' Complaint are true, Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred in whole or in part on the grounds that the alleged acts or omissions of Defendant was not the proximate cause of Plaintiffs' alleged damages, if any, and Plaintiffs were not injured or damaged by any of the acts or omissions alleged in the Complaint.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Probable Damages)

8. Assuming without admitting, for purposes of this affirmative defense only, that any of the allegations in Plaintiffs' Complaint are true, Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred in whole or in part on the grounds that Plaintiffs' alleged damages, if any, are too remote and speculative from any alleged acts or omissions by Defendant.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Equal Dignities)

9. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred in whole or in part by the Equal Dignities Rule.

28

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2	(Accord and Satisfaction)
3	10. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
4	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by accord and satisfaction.
5	ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
6	(Contributory Negligence)
7	11. Assuming without admitting, for purposes of this affirmative defense
8	only, that any of the allegations in Plaintiffs' Complaint are true, Plaintiffs have
9	failed to exercise ordinary care, caution or prudence and the damages, if any, which
10	Plaintiffs allege, were proximately caused and contributed to by the negligence of
11	Plaintiffs and therefore such damages, if any, are barred and/or must be reduced in
12	proportion to Plaintiffs' own negligence.
13	TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
14	(Excuse of Performance)
15	12. The contractual obligations, if any, on the part of Defendant have been
16	excused and discharged by Plaintiffs' own breaches.
17	THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
18	(Absence of Breach or Fault)
19	13. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
20	action therein, fails in whole or in part for the absence of any breach or fault on the
21	part of Defendant.
22	FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
23	(Consent)
24	14. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
25	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by Plaintiffs' consent.
26	
27	
28	

1	FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2	(Setoff and Recoupment)
3	15. Assuming without admitting, for purposes of this affirmative defense
4	only, that any of the allegations in Plaintiffs' Complaint are true and that Defendant
5	caused damage to Plaintiffs in any respect, Defendant is entitled to offset and recoup
6	against any judgment that may be entered for Plaintiffs all obligations of Plaintiffs
7	owing to Defendant.
8	SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
9	(Waiver)
10	16. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
11	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of waiver.
12	SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
13	(Estoppel)
14	17. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
15	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of estoppel.
16	EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
17	(Ratification)
18	18. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
19	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by Plaintiffs' ratification and approval of
20	the alleged acts and/or omissions of which they now complain.
21	NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
22	(Good Faith Defense)
23	19. Defendant is not liable, vicariously or otherwise, because Defendant
24	acted at all times in good faith and did not directly, or indirectly, participate in or
25	commit the alleged wrongful acts of which Plaintiffs complain.
26	
27	
28	
	ANSWER OF DEFENDANT AND

1	TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2	(Failure to Perform Conditions Precedent)
3	20. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
4	action therein, is barred in whole or in part because Plaintiffs have not fully and
5	fairly performed all conditions precedent in the documents, including, without
6	limitation, in the Building Loan Agreement (including as amended), the Deed of
7	Trust, and the Note, under which Plaintiffs seek relief.
8	TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
9	(Contribution)
10	21. If Defendant is found to be in any manner liable for the acts complained
11	of in the Complaint, which liability is denied by Defendant, such harm was
12	proximately caused, or contributed to, by other persons or entities, including
13	Plaintiffs. It is necessary that the proportionate degree of fault of every said person
14	or entity be determined and prorated and that a judgment, if any, which might be
15	rendered against Defendant be reduced by that degree of fault found to exist on the
16	part of such other persons or entities.
17	TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
18	(Adequate Remedy at Law)
19	22. Plaintiffs' claims for equitable relief are barred in whole or in part
20	because Plaintiffs have an adequate remedy at law.
21	TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
22	(Privilege)
23	23. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
24	action therein, is barred in whole or in part to the extent that any or all of the acts or
25	omissions alleged to have been performed by Defendant, if performed at all, were
26	privileged or justified.
27	
28	

1	TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2	(In Pari Delicto)
3	24. Plaintiffs' Complaint is barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of <i>In</i>
4	Pari Delicto.
5	TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
6	(No Punitive Damages)
7	25. To the extent Plaintiffs seek recovery of punitive damages, such
8	damages are not recoverable and/or are not warranted.
9	TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
10	(Unconstitutional Punitive or Exemplary Damages)
11	26. Assuming without admitting for purposes of this affirmative defense
12	only, that Plaintiffs have any claims against Defendant, Defendant is not liable for
13	punitive or exemplary damages to the extent such damages do not comport with the
14	due process and other clauses of the California and/or United States Constitutions.
15	TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
16	(Statutes of Frauds)
17	27. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
18	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by the applicable statutes of frauds.
19	TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
20	(Failure to Do Equity)
21	28. Assuming without admitting for purposes of this affirmative defense
22	only, that Plaintiffs have any claims against Defendant, Defendant alleges that
23	Plaintiffs failed to do equity in the matters alleged in the Complaint, and any
24	recovery by Plaintiffs must be diminished or barred by reason thereof.
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	TWENTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
2	(Unjust Enrichment)			
3	29. Defendant alleges that Plaintiffs would be unjustly enriched if they were			
4	to be granted any relief, damages or sums as a result of any alleged act or omission			
5	on the part of Defendant.			
6	THIRTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
7	(Mutual Mistake of Fact)			
8	30. Plaintiffs' Complaint is barred in whole or in part due to a mutual			
9	mistake of fact.			
10	THIRTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
11	(Unilateral Mistake of Fact)			
12	31. Plaintiffs' Complaint is barred in whole or in part due to a unilateral			
13	mistake of fact.			
14	THIRTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
15	(Frustration of Purpose)			
16	32. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of			
17	action therein, is barred in whole or in part because frustration of purpose excused			
18	Defendant from performing in the manner that Plaintiffs allege Defendant was			
19	obligated to perform.			
20	THIRTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
21	(Breach of Duty of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)			
22	33. Assuming without admitting for purposes of this affirmative defense			
23	only, that Plaintiffs have any claims against Defendant, Plaintiffs' Complaint,			
24	including each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred in whole or in			
25	part by Plaintiffs' breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing implicit in			
26	every contract.			
27				
28				
	ii			

1	THIRTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2	(Lack of Consideration)
3	34. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
4	action therein, is barred in whole or in part because one or more of the alleged oral
5	contracts that Plaintiffs seeks to enforce fails for lack of consideration.
6	THIRTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
7	(Performance and/or Discharge)
8	35. Defendant has duly and fully performed, satisfied and/or discharged any
9	duties and obligations allegedly owed to Plaintiff arising out of any alleged contracts,
10	whether written or oral.
11	THIRTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
12	(D'Oench Duhme Doctrine)
13	36. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
14	action therein, is barred in whole or in part by the D'Oench Duhme doctrine,
15	including, without limitation, as codified in 12 U.S.C. section 1823 and any and all
16	regulations thereunder.
17	THIRTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
18	(Lack of Jurisdiction)
19	37. Plaintiffs' Complaint, including each and every purported cause of
20	action therein, is barred in whole or in part because, under the Financial Institutions
21	Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989, 12 U.S.C. § 1821(d)(13)(D), the
22	Court lacks jurisdiction to decide such claims.
23	THIRTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
24	(Reservation of Additional Defenses)
25	38. Defendant has not completed its investigation and/or discovery
26	regarding the allegations asserted by Plaintiffs. Accordingly, Defendant reserves the
27	right to assert additional defenses as necessary based on its ongoing investigation
28	and/or discovery.

1	<u>PRAYER</u>				
2	WHEREFORE, Defendant prays for judgment as follows:				
3	1.	That Plaintiffs take nothing	by way of their Complaint;		
4	2.	That judgment be entered in	n favor of Defendant and against Plaintiffs		
5	and that the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice;				
6	3. That Defendant be awarded its attorneys' fees and costs of suit herein				
7	wherever allowed by law or contract; and				
8	4.	For such other and further r	relief as the Court deems just and proper.		
9					
10	Dated: Jun	ne 8, 2011	ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP		
11			A. KRISTINE FLOYD NICHOLAS S. SHANTAR		
12					
13			By: /s/A. Kristine Floyd A. KRISTINE FLOYD		
14			Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant INDYMAC		
15			VENTURE, LLC		
16		JURY	DEMAND		
17	Defendant and Counterclaimant Indymac Venture, LLC demands a trial by				
18	jury on all issues so triable.				
19	J J				
20	Dated: Jun	ne 8, 2011	ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE		
21	2 acces 7 and 0, 2011		MALLORY & NATSIS LLP A. KRISTINE FLOYD		
22			NICHOLAS S. SHANTAR		
23			By: /s/A. Kristine Floyd		
24			A. KRISTINE FLOYD Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant INDYMAC		
25			Counterclaimant INDYMAC VENTURE, LLC		
26 27					
28					
			ANSWER OF DEFENDANT AND		
Gamble			COUNTEDCI AIMANT INDVMAC		

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	The undersigned hereby certifies that: I am over the age of eighteen (18) and
3	not a party to the within action. I am employed in the law firm of Allen Matkins
4	Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP, 1900 Main Street, Fifth Floor, Irvine,
5	California 92614-7321.
6	On June 8, 2011, I used the Northern District of California's Electronic Case
7	Filing System, with the ECF registered to A. Kristine Floyd to file the following
8	document:
9	ANSWER OF DEFENDANT AND COUNTERCLAIMANT
10	INDYMAC VENTURE, LLC TO COMPLAINT
11	[DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL]
12	
13	The ECF system is designed to send an e-mail message to all parties in the
14	case, which constitutes service. The parties by e-mail in this case are found on the
15	Court's Electronic Mail Notice List.
16	Notice has been given via First Class U.S. Mail to:
17	W. Kenneth Howard, Esq.
18	Attorney At Law 116 East Campbell Avenue, Suite 7
19	Campbell, California 95008
20	Phone: (408) 379-1904 Fax: (408) 379-1902
21	
22	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of
23	America that the foregoing is true and correct.
24	Executed on June 8, 2011, at Irvine, California.
25	
26	By: <u>/s/A. Kristine Floyd</u> A. KRISTINE FLOYD
27	
28	